

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA

Larry Coles, Jr., ) C/A No. 1:20-3077-BHH  
                      )  
                      Plaintiff, )  
                      )  
                     vs.      ) ORDER AND OPINION  
                      )  
Major Jeff Johnson, )  
                      )  
                     Defendant. )

---

This matter is before the Court for review of the Report and Recommendation (“Report”) of United States Magistrate Judge Shiva V. Hodges, made in accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 636(b) and Local Rule 73.02 for the District of South Carolina. On September 10, 2020, Magistrate Judge Hodges issued a Report recommending that this action be dismissed *with prejudice* for Petitioner’s failure to allege sufficient facts to meet the test in *Younger v. Harris*, 402 U.S. 37 (1971). (ECF No. 11.)

The Magistrate Judge makes only a recommendation to this Court. The recommendation has no presumptive weight. The responsibility to make a final determination remains with this Court. See *Mathews v. Weber*, 423 U.S. 261, 270–71 (1976). The Court may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the findings or recommendations made by the Magistrate Judge. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). The Court may also receive further evidence or recommit the matter to the Magistrate Judge with instructions. *Id.* The Court is charged with making a *de novo* determination of those portions of the Report to which specific objections are made.

Plaintiff filed a document entitled “Report and Recommendation,” which was entered as an objection to the Magistrate Judge’s Report, as well as a letter, both of which

the Court has carefully reviewed. (ECF Nos. 13 & 14.) Objections to the Report must be specific. Failure to file specific objections constitutes a waiver of a party's right to further judicial review, including appellate review, if the recommendation is accepted by the district judge. *United States v. Schronce*, 727 F.2d 91, 94 & n.4 (4th Cir. 1984). In the absence of specific objections to the Report, this court is not required to give any explanation for adopting the recommendation. See *Camby v. Davis*, 718 F.2d 198, 199 (4th Cir. 1983).

Upon review, the Court finds that Plaintiff's "objections" are non-specific, unrelated to the dispositive portions of the Report, or merely restate his claims. Plaintiff's objections provide no basis for this Court to deviate from the Magistrate Judge's recommended disposition. Therefore, after a thorough review of the Report, the record, and the applicable law, the Court finds that Plaintiff's objections are without merit.

Accordingly, the Report and Recommendation (ECF No. 11) is adopted and incorporated herein by reference, and this action is DISMISSED *with prejudice*, without leave for further amendment, and without issuance and service of process.

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

/s/Bruce Howe Hendricks  
United States District Judge

March 3, 2021  
Greenville, South Carolina

\*\*\*\*\*

**NOTICE OF RIGHT TO APPEAL**

The parties are hereby notified that any right to appeal this Order is governed by Rules 3 and 4 of the Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure.